

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, and 16-20 are presently pending. Claim 21 is added. Continued Examination is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of Kono and Adolph. Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "a FIFO for storing indicators indicating images to be displayed". Examiner has indicated that "Kono does not particularly teach a queue comprises a FIFO for storing indicators indicating images to be displayed". Office Action, at 4.

In the Office Action of 5/22/2008 at 2-3, Examiner indicated that:

Adolph teaches a memory (16 of fig. 7) for storing indicators (A,B,C, 16 of fig. 7) indicating images to be displayed, which is the same function as a FIFO for storing indicators indicating images to be display (130 of fig. 1 of the present invention; see [0032]), the memory (16 of fig. 7) stores the indicators on a particular order (A, B, and C order), and wherein the display engine displays the picture associated with the indicators in an order corresponding to the order that the indicators are stored in the queue (fig. 8, note updating the corresponding entry for the decoded video frame in a table with the following information items: a reference to the frame memory in which the decoded video frame is stored, follow up information regarding the displaying status of the video frames in the frame memories)."

Assignee presented various arguments in the response of 8/15/2008. However, in the "Response to Arguments", Office Action at 5, Examiner has generally repeated the foregoing.

Assignee maintains traversal of the rejections to claims 1, 5, 8, 11 (because Adolph does not teach "a FIFO for storing indicators indicating images to be displayed")

and 16, and the dependent claims for the reasons indicated in the response of 8/15/2008, which are not repeated for the sake of brevity.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 21 recites, among other limitations, "wherein the FIFO stores the indicators in the particular order prior to the display engine displaying the images associated with the indicators in the order corresponding to the order that the indicators are stored in the FIFO".

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that the foregoing is taught at paragraphs 0033-0034:

At 222, the decode engine 120 places an indicator at the end of the FIFO queue 130 indicating the image to be displayed at the nearest time in the future.

[0034] At 225, the display engine 120 retrieves the top element in the FIFO queue 130. The top element in the FIFO queue 130 indicates the next image to be displayed. At 230, the display engine 120 retrieves the image indicated by the top element in the FIFO queue 130 and the parameters stored in the parameter buffer 125b associated with the frame buffer 125a. At 235, the display engine 120 presents the image for display using the parameters stored in the parameter buffer 125b.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

January 8, 2009

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100